arXiv:math/0702558v86 [math.AC] 4 Dec 2009

Bounds of some real (complex) solution of a finite system of polynomial equations with rational coefficients

Apoloniusz Tyszka

Abstract. We discuss two conjectures. **(I)** For each $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}$ ($\mathbb{C}$) there exist $y_1, \ldots, y_n \in \mathbb{R}$ ($\mathbb{C}$) such that

$$\forall i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \; |y_i| \leq 2^{2^{n-2}}$$
$$\forall i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \; (x_i = 1 \Rightarrow y_i = 1)$$
$$\forall i, j, k \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \; (x_i + x_j = x_k \Rightarrow y_i + y_j = y_k)$$
$$\forall i, j, k \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \; (x_i \cdot x_j = x_k \Rightarrow y_i \cdot y_j = y_k)$$

(II) Let $\boldsymbol{G}$ be an additive subgroup of $\mathbb{C}$. Then for each $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \boldsymbol{G}$ there exist $y_1, \ldots, y_n \in \boldsymbol{G} \cap \mathbb{Q}$ such that

$$\forall i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \; |y_i| \leq 2^{n-1}$$
$$\forall i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \; (x_i = 1 \Rightarrow y_i = 1)$$
$$\forall i, j, k \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \; (x_i + x_j = x_k \Rightarrow y_i + y_j = y_k)$$

For a positive integer n we define the set of equations E_n by

$$E_n = \{x_i = 1 : \; 1 \leq i \leq n\} \cup$$
$$\{x_i + x_j = x_k : \; 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n, \; 1 \leq k \leq n\} \cup \{x_i \cdot x_j = x_k : \; 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n, \; 1 \leq k \leq n\}$$

Since there is a finite number of non-empty subsets of E_n, we get:

(1) There is a function $\chi : \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\} \to \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\}$ with the property: for each positive integer n, if a non-empty subset of E_n forms a system of equations that is consistent over $\mathbb{Z}$, then this system has a solution being a sequence of integers whose absolute values are not greater than $\chi(n)$.

(2) There is a function $\gamma : \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\} \to \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\}$ with the property: for each positive integer n, if a non-empty subset of E_n forms a system of equations that is consistent over $\mathbb{R}$, then this system has a solution being a sequence of real numbers whose absolute values are not greater than $\gamma(n)$.

(3) There is a function $\theta : \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\} \to \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\}$ with the property: for each positive integer n, if a non-empty subset of E_n forms a system of equations that is consistent over $\mathbb{C}$, then this system has a solution being a sequence of complex numbers whose absolute values are not greater than $\theta(n)$.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 03B30, 12D99, 12L12, 14P05, 15A06, 26C10.

Key words and phrases: system of polynomial (linear) equations, solution with minimal l_∞ norm.

Remark. Let us consider the problem of finding a complex solution of a polynomial system with n variables and integer coefficients. This problem reduces to the problem of finding a real solution of some polynomial system with $2n$ variables and integer coefficients. Therefore, the problem of consistency over $\mathbb{C}$ of a polynomial system with n variables and integer coefficients reduces to the problem of consistency over $\mathbb{R}$ of some polynomial system with $2n$ variables and integer coefficients.

Let us note three facts:

(4) There is a finite number of non-empty subsets of E_n.

(5) There is an algorithm for quantifier elimination for $(\mathbb{R}, +, \cdot, 0, 1, =, \leq)$ (A. Tarski and A. Seidenberg, and later G. E. Collins with his cylindrical algebraic decomposition algorithm, see [1]). In particular, there is an algorithm checking the consistency over $\mathbb{R}$ of each finite system of polynomial equations with integer coefficients.

(6) Applying the cylindrical algebraic decomposition algorithm, for each consistent finite system of polynomial equations with n variables and integer coefficients, we can determine $a > 0$ such that $[-a, a]^n$ contains a solution.

By the Remark and facts **(4)**, **(5)**, **(6)**, we can find computable γ and θ.

There are known direct estimates which enable us to find computable γ. Let $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a real algebraic variety given by the system of equations $f_1 = \ldots = f_m = 0$, where $f_i \in \mathbb{Q}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ $(i = 1, \ldots, m)$. We denote by L the maximum of the bit-sizes of the coefficients of the system and set $d = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{m} \deg(f_i)$, $r = \binom{n+2d}{n}$. We recall ([1, p. 245]) that the bit-size of a non-zero integer is the number of bits in its binary representation. More precisely, the bit-size of $k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ is τ if and only if $2^{\tau-1} \leq |k| < 2^{\tau}$. The bit-size of a rational number is the sum of the bit-sizes of its numerator and denominator. N. N. Vorobjov Jr. proved ([20]) that there exists $(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in V$ such that $|x_i| < 2^{H(r,L)}$ $(i = 1, \ldots, n)$, where H is some polynomial not depending on the initial system; for a simplified proof see [7, Lemma 9, p. 56]. A more general bound follows from [1, Theorem 13.15, p. 476].

Let M be the maximum of the absolute values of the coefficients of the polynomials $f_1(x_1, \ldots, x_n), \ldots, f_m(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$. Assume that the system

$$f_1(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = \ldots = f_m(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = 0$$

is consistent over $\mathbb{R}$ ($\mathbb{C}$). Let $d(i,j)$ be the degree of variable x_i in the polynomial $f_j(x_1,\ldots,x_n)$. Assume that $d_i = \max\{d(i,j) : 1 \leq j \leq m\} \geq 1$ for each $i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$. Let $\mathcal{T}$ denote the family of all polynomials $W(x_1,\ldots,x_n) \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1,\ldots,x_n]$ for which all coefficients belong to the interval $[-M,M]$ and each variable x_i has degree less than or equal to d_i. Then, $\{x_1,\ldots,x_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ and

$$\text{card } \mathcal{T} = (2M+1)^{(d_1+1)\cdot\ldots\cdot(d_n+1)}$$

To each polynomial that belongs to $\mathcal{T} \setminus \{x_1,\ldots,x_n\}$ we assign a new variable x_i with $i \in \{n+1,\ldots,(2M+1)^{(d_1+1)\cdot\ldots\cdot(d_n+1)}\}$. Let $\mathcal{K}$ denote the family of all equations of the form

$$x_i = 1,\; x_i + x_j = x_k,\; x_i \cdot x_j = x_k \;\; (i,j,k \in \{1,\ldots,(2M+1)^{(d_1+1)\cdot\ldots\cdot(d_n+1)}\})$$

which are polynomial identities in $\mathbb{Z}[x_1,\ldots,x_n]$. Let $f_j(x_1,\ldots,x_n) = x_{q(j)}$, where $j \in \{1,\ldots,m\}$ and $q(j) \in \{1,\ldots,(2M+1)^{(d_1+1)\cdot\ldots\cdot(d_n+1)}\}$. The system

$$f_1(x_1,\ldots,x_n) = \ldots = f_m(x_1,\ldots,x_n) = 0$$

can be equivalently write down as

$$\mathcal{K} \cup \{x_{q(1)} + x_{q(1)} = x_{q(1)}, \ldots, x_{q(m)} + x_{q(m)} = x_{q(m)}\}$$

We have proved that introducing additional variables we can equivalently write down the system

$$f_1(x_1,\ldots,x_n) = \ldots = f_m(x_1,\ldots,x_n) = 0$$

as a system of equations of the form $x_i = 1$, $x_i + x_j = x_k$, $x_i \cdot x_j = x_k$, where $i,j,k \in \{1,\ldots,(2M+1)^{(d_1+1)\cdot\ldots\cdot(d_n+1)}\}$ and the variables $x_{n+1},\ldots,x_{(2M+1)^{(d_1+1)\cdot\ldots\cdot(d_n+1)}}$ are new.

Conjecture 1. Let S be a consistent system of equations in real (complex) numbers $x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_n$, where each equation in S is one of the following three forms: $x_i = 1$ or $x_i + x_j = x_k$ or $x_i \cdot x_j = x_k$. Then S has a real (complex) solution $(x_1,\ldots,x_n)$ in which $|x_i| \leq 2^{2^{n-2}}$ for each i.

Conjecture 1 implies that the system

$$f_1(x_1,\ldots,x_n) = \ldots = f_m(x_1,\ldots,x_n) = 0$$

has a real (complex) solution $(x_1,\ldots,x_n)$ in which $|x_i| \leq 2^{2^{(2M+1)^{(d_1+1)\cdot\ldots\cdot(d_n+1)}-2}}$ for each i. This upper bound is rough because does not depend on the number of equations. We describe a better bound that depends on m. Let

$$L = \{(s_1,\ldots,s_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n : \;\; (0 \leq s_1 \leq d_1) \wedge \ldots \wedge (0 \leq s_n \leq d_n) \wedge (1 \leq s_1 + \ldots + s_n)\}$$

$$f_j(x_1,\ldots,x_n) = a_j + \sum_{(s_1,\ldots,s_n)\in L} a_j(s_1,\ldots,s_n)\cdot x_1^{s_1}\ldots x_n^{s_n}$$

where $j \in \{1,\ldots,m\}$, $a_j \in \mathbb{Z}$, $a_j(s_1,\ldots,s_n) \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let $\mathcal{L} = \{x_1^{s_1}\ldots x_n^{s_n} : \ (s_1,\ldots s_n) \in L\}$. Of course, $\{x_1,\ldots,x_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$. We define the lexicographic order $\preceq$ on $\mathcal{L}$. We will define new variables x_i.

Step 1. To each integer in $[-M, M]$ we assign a separate variable x_i.
In this step we introduce $2M+1$ new variables.

Step 2. To each monomial in $\mathcal{L} \setminus \{x_1,\ldots,x_n\}$ we assign a separate variable x_i.
In this step we introduce $(d_1+1)\cdot\ldots\cdot(d_n+1)-1-n$ new variables.

Step 3. To each monomial $a_j(s_1,\ldots,s_n)\cdot x_1^{s_1}\ldots x_n^{s_n}$ $(j \in \{1,\ldots,m\}, (s_1,\ldots,s_n) \in L)$ we assign a separate variable x_i.
In this step we introduce $m\cdot((d_1+1)\cdot\ldots\cdot(d_n+1)-1)$ new variables.

Step 4. To each polynomial $a_j + \sum\limits_{(t_1,\ldots,t_n)\preceq(s_1,\ldots,s_n)} a_j(t_1,\ldots,t_n)\cdot x_1^{t_1}\ldots x_n^{t_n}$ $(j \in \{1,\ldots,m\}, (s_1,\ldots,s_n) \in L)$ we assign a separate variable x_i.
In this step we introduce $m\cdot((d_1+1)\cdot\ldots\cdot(d_n+1)-1)$ new variables.

The total number of new variables is equal to

$$p = 2(M-m) - n + (2m+1)\cdot(d_1+1)\cdot\ldots\cdot(d_n+1)$$

Without lost of generality we can assume that we have introduced the variables $x_{n+1},\ldots,x_{n+p}$. Let $\mathcal{H}$ denote the family of all equations of the form

$$x_i = 1,\ x_i + x_j = x_k,\ x_i\cdot x_j = x_k \quad (i,j,k \in \{1,\ldots,n+p\})$$

which are polynomial identities in $\mathbb{Z}[x_1,\ldots,x_n]$. Let $f_j(x_1,\ldots,x_n) = x_{q(j)}$, where $j \in \{1,\ldots,m\}$ and $q(j) \in \{1,\ldots,n+p\}$. The system

$$f_1(x_1,\ldots,x_n) = \ldots = f_m(x_1,\ldots,x_n) = 0$$

can be equivalently write down as

$$\mathcal{H} \cup \{x_{q(1)} + x_{q(1)} = x_{q(1)},\ldots,x_{q(m)} + x_{q(m)} = x_{q(m)}\}$$

Conjecture 1 implies that the system

$$f_1(x_1,\ldots,x_n) = \ldots = f_m(x_1,\ldots,x_n) = 0$$

has a real (complex) solution $(x_1,\ldots,x_n)$ in which $|x_i| \leq 2^{2^{2(M-m)-2+(2m+1)\cdot(d_1+1)\cdot\ldots\cdot(d_n+1)}}$ for each i.

Concerning Conjecture 1, for $n=1$ estimation by $2^{2^{n-2}}$ can be replaced by estimation by 1. For $n>1$ estimation by $2^{2^{n-2}}$ is the best estimation. Indeed, let $n>1$ and $\widetilde{x_1}=1$, $\widetilde{x_2}=2^{2^0}$, $\widetilde{x_3}=2^{2^1}$, $\ldots$, $\widetilde{x_n}=2^{2^{n-2}}$. In any ring $\boldsymbol{K}$ of characteristic 0, from the system of all equations belonging to E_n and are satisfied under the substitution $[x_1 \to \widetilde{x_1},\ \ldots,\ x_n \to \widetilde{x_n}]$, it follows that $x_1=\widetilde{x_1}, \ldots, x_n=\widetilde{x_n}$.

If a system $S \subseteq E_1$ is consistent over $\mathbb{C}$, then S has a solution $\widehat{x_1} \in \{0,1\}$. This proves Conjecture 1 for $n=1$. If a system $S \subseteq E_2$ is consistent over $\mathbb{C}$, then S has a solution $(\widehat{x_1},\widehat{x_2}) \in \{(0,0),(0,1),(1,0),(\frac{1}{2},1),(1,\frac{1}{2}),(1,1),(1,2),(2,1)\}$. This proves Conjecture 1 for $n=2$. Let

$$\mathcal{W}=\Big\{\{1\},\{0\},\{1,0\},\{1,2\},\left\{1,\frac{1}{2}\right\},\left\{1,2,\frac{1}{2}\right\},\{1,0,2\},\left\{1,0,\frac{1}{2}\right\},$$
$$\{1,0,-1\},\{1,2,-1\},\{1,2,3\},\{1,2,4\},\left\{1,\frac{1}{2},-\frac{1}{2}\right\},\left\{1,\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{4}\right\},\left\{1,\frac{1}{2},\frac{3}{2}\right\},$$
$$\{1,-1,-2\},\left\{1,\frac{1}{3},\frac{2}{3}\right\},\left\{1,2,\sqrt{2}\right\},\left\{1,\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right\},\left\{1,\sqrt{2},\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right\},$$
$$\left\{1,\frac{\sqrt{5}-1}{2},\frac{\sqrt{5}+1}{2}\right\},\left\{1,\frac{\sqrt{5}+1}{2},\frac{\sqrt{5}+3}{2}\right\},\left\{1,\frac{-\sqrt{5}-1}{2},\frac{\sqrt{5}+3}{2}\right\}\Big\}$$

If a system $S \subseteq E_3$ is consistent over $\mathbb{R}$, then S has a real solution $(\widehat{x_1},\widehat{x_2},\widehat{x_3})$ with $\{\widehat{x_1}\} \cup \{\widehat{x_2}\} \cup \{\widehat{x_3}\} \in \mathcal{W}$. This proves Conjecture 1 for $\mathbb{R}$ and $n=3$. If a system $S \subseteq E_3$ is consistent over $\mathbb{C}$, then S has a solution $(\widehat{x_1},\widehat{x_2},\widehat{x_3})$ with $\{\widehat{x_1}\} \cup \{\widehat{x_2}\} \cup \{\widehat{x_3}\} \in \mathcal{W} \cup \left\{\left\{1,\frac{-1+\sqrt{-3}}{2},\frac{1+\sqrt{-3}}{2}\right\},\left\{1,\frac{1-\sqrt{-3}}{2},\frac{1+\sqrt{-3}}{2}\right\}\right\}$. This proves Conjecture 1 for $\mathbb{C}$ and $n=3$.

Now we demonstrate the use of the *Mathematica* software for checking Conjecture 1 for $n=3$. Without lost of generality, we can adopt the following assumptions which allow for reducing the number of studied systems $S \subseteq E_3$.

(7) The equation $x_1=1$ belongs to system S, as when all equations $x_1=1$, $x_2=1$, $x_3=1$ do not belong to system S, then system S has the solution $(0,0,0)$.

(8) Equations $x_1+x_1=x_1$, $x_1+x_2=x_2$, $x_1+x_3=x_3$ do not belong to system S, as each of these equations is contradictory when $x_1=1$.

(9) We only consider these systems S where each real solution $(1,\widehat{x_2},\widehat{x_3})$ has pairwise different 1, $\widehat{x_2}$, $\widehat{x_3}$, as Conjecture 1 is proven for $n=2$. Therefore, all equations $x_1 \cdot x_i = x_j$ $(i \neq j)$ do not belong to system S.

(10) Instead of each equation $x_1+x_1=x_i$ $(i=2,3)$ we consider the equation $x_i=2$.

(11) Instead of each equation $x_i+x_i=x_1$ $(i=2,3)$ we consider the equation $x_i=\frac{1}{2}$.

(12) Instead of each equation $x_i+x_j=x_j$ $(2 \le i \le j \le 3)$ we consider the equation $x_i=0$.

(13) Instead of each equation $x_i+x_j=x_i$ $(1 \le i \le j \le 3,\ 2 \le j)$ we consider the equation $x_j=0$.

(14) All equations $x_i \cdot x_j = x_i$ $(1 \le i \le j \le 3)$ do not belong to system S, because they are met when $j=1$, and when $j>1$ they are equivalent to equation $x_i=0$.

(15) All equations $x_i \cdot x_j = x_j$ $(1 \le i \le j \le 3)$ do not belong to system S, because they are met when $i=1$, and when $i>1$ they are equivalent to equation $x_j=0$.

After replacement of variables x_1, x_2, x_3 with 1 and variables x, y, instead of set E_3 we receive 16 equations:

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} x=2 & y=2 & x=\frac{1}{2} & y=\frac{1}{2} & x=0 & y=0 \\ x\cdot x=y & x\cdot x=1 & x+x=y & y\cdot y=x & y\cdot y=1 & y+y=x \\ & x\cdot y=1 & x+y=1 & x+1=y & y+1=x & \end{array}$$

If $n=3$, the following code in *Mathematica* verifies Conjecture 1 for $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{C}$:

```
Clear[x, y, i, j]
A := {x == 2, y == 2, x == 1/2, y == 1/2, x == 0, y == 0, x*x == y,
  x*x == 1, x + x == y, y*y == x, y*y == 1, y + y == x, x*y == 1,
  x + y == 1, x + 1 == y, y + 1 == x}
f[i_, j_] :=
 Reduce[Exists[{x, y},
    A[[i]] && A[[j]] && (Abs[x] > 4 || Abs[y] > 4)], Complexes] /;
  i < j
f[i_, j_] := {} /; i >= j
Union[Flatten[Table[f[i, j], {i, 1, 16}, {j, 1, 16}]]]
```

The output is {`False`}.

Theorem 1. If $n \in \{1,2,3\}$, then Conjecture 1 holds true for each subring $\boldsymbol{K} \subseteq \mathbb{C}$.

Proof. If a system $S \subseteq E_1$ is consistent over $\boldsymbol{K}$, then S has a solution $\widehat{x_1} \in \{0,1\}$. If a system $S \subseteq E_2$ is consistent over $\boldsymbol{K}$ and $\frac{1}{2} \notin \boldsymbol{K}$, then S has a solution $(\widehat{x_1}, \widehat{x_2}) \in \{(0,0),(0,1),(1,0),(1,1),(1,2),(2,1)\}$. If a system $S \subseteq E_2$ is consistent over $\boldsymbol{K}$ and $\frac{1}{2} \in \boldsymbol{K}$, then S has a solution $(\widehat{x_1}, \widehat{x_2}) \in \{(0,0),(0,1),(1,0),(\frac{1}{2},1),(1,\frac{1}{2}),(1,1),(1,2),(2,1)\}$. For reducing the number of studied systems $S \subseteq E_3$, we may assume that the equation $x_1 = 1$ belongs to S, as when all equations $x_1 = 1$, $x_2 = 1$, $x_3 = 1$ do not belong to S, then S has the solution $(0,0,0) \in \boldsymbol{K}^3$. Let

$$A_2 = \{\widehat{x_2} \in \mathbb{C} : \text{ there exists } \widehat{x_3} \in \mathbb{C} \text{ for which } (1, \widehat{x_2}, \widehat{x_3}) \text{ solves } S\}$$

$$A_3 = \{\widehat{x_3} \in \mathbb{C} : \text{ there exists } \widehat{x_2} \in \mathbb{C} \text{ for which } (1, \widehat{x_2}, \widehat{x_3}) \text{ solves } S\}$$

We may assume that $A_2 \not\subseteq \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq 4\}$ or $A_3 \not\subseteq \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq 4\}$.

Case 1: $A_2 \not\subseteq \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq 4\}$ and $A_3 \subseteq \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq 4\}$. If $(1, \widehat{x_2}, \widehat{x_3}) \in \boldsymbol{K}^3$ solves S, then $(1, 1, \widehat{x_3}) \in \boldsymbol{K}^3$ solves S.

Case 2: $A_2 \subseteq \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq 4\}$ and $A_3 \not\subseteq \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq 4\}$. If $(1, \widehat{x_2}, \widehat{x_3}) \in \boldsymbol{K}^3$ solves S, then $(1, \widehat{x_2}, 1) \in \boldsymbol{K}^3$ solves S.

Case 3: $A_2 \not\subseteq \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq 4\}$ and $A_3 \not\subseteq \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq 4\}$. If $(1, \widehat{x_2}, \widehat{x_3}) \in \boldsymbol{K}^3$ solves S, then $(1,0,1) \in \boldsymbol{K}^3$ solves S or $(1,1,0) \in \boldsymbol{K}^3$ solves S or $(1,1,1) \in \boldsymbol{K}^3$ solves S.

□

Conjecture 1 holds true for each $n \in \{1,2,3,4\}$ and each subring $\boldsymbol{K} \subseteq \mathbb{C}$. It follows from the following Observation 1 which borrows the idea from the proof of Theorem 1.

Observation 1. Let $n \in \{1,2,3,4\}$, and let $S \subseteq E_n$ be a system that is consistent over the subring $\boldsymbol{K} \subseteq \mathbb{C}$. If $(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \boldsymbol{K}^n$ solves S, then $(\widehat{x_1}, \ldots, \widehat{x_n})$ solves S, where each $\widehat{x_i}$ is suitably chosen from $\{x_i, 0, 1, 2, \frac{1}{2}\} \cap \{z \in \boldsymbol{K} : \ |z| \leq 2^{2^{n-2}}\}$.

Multiple execution of the algorithm described in items **(16)**-**(20)** yields partial (as probabilistic) resolution of Conjecture 1 for $\mathbb{R}$ and $n \geq 4$. This algorithm resolves Conjecture 1 for some randomly chosen subsystem of E_n.

(16) From the set E_n we remove the equations

$$\begin{array}{ll}
x_i = 1 & (1 \le i \le n) \\
x_1 + x_i = x_i & (1 \le i \le n) \\
x_1 + x_1 = x_i & (i \neq 2) \\
x_i + x_i = x_1 & (i \neq 3) \\
x_i + x_j = x_i & (1 \le i \le j \le n, (i,j) \neq (4,4)) \\
x_i + x_j = x_j & (1 \le i \le j \le n, (i,j) \neq (4,4)) \\
x_i \cdot x_j = x_i & (1 \le i \le j \le n) \\
x_i \cdot x_j = x_j & (1 \le i \le j \le n) \\
x_1 \cdot x_i = x_j & (i,j \in \{1,2,\dots,n\})
\end{array}$$

and in other equations we replace x_1 by number 1. We obtain a non-empty set H_n.

(17) We introduce a random linear order on H_n, but with a reservation that the first equation is to be among equations involving number 1.

(18) We define by induction a finite sequence $(s_1, \dots, s_m)$ of equations belonging to H_n. As s_1 we put the first equation in H_n. After this, we remove from H_n all equations having the left side identical to the left side of equation s_1; this step may be omitted. When the sequence $(s_1, \dots, s_i)$ is defined, and there exists $h \in H_n \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_i\}$ for which the system $\{s_1, \dots, s_i, h\}$ has a real solution $(x_2, \dots, x_n)$ with pairwise different $1, x_2, \dots, x_n$, then as s_{i+1} we put the smallest such h. After this, we remove from H_n all equations having the left side identical to the left side of equation s_{i+1}; this step may be omitted. If such h does not exist, then $m = i$ and the construction of the sequence $(s_1, \dots, s_m)$ is finished.

The condition "with pairwise different $1, x_2, \dots, x_n$" may be removed from item **(18)**, but this will increase the average number of executions of item **(18)**.

(19) If any of the systems $\{s_1, \dots, s_m, x_i = 1\}$ $(i = 2, \dots, n)$, $\{s_1, \dots, s_m, x_i = x_j\}$ $(2 \le i < j \le n)$ has a real solution, then we return to item **(17)**.

(20) We resolve Conjecture 1 for $\mathbb{R}$ for the latest system $\{s_1, \dots, s_m\}$.

The above algorithm resolves Conjecture 1 only for these subsystems of H_n for which each real solution $(x_2, \dots, x_n)$ satisfies $\mathrm{card}(\{1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}) = n$. It is sufficient if Conjecture 1 was previously resolved for $n - 1$ real variables.

In the computer execution of items **(18)-(20)** one may use *Mathematica* software and the *CylindricalDecomposition* or *Reduce* procedure. The algorithm for Conjecture 1 for $\mathbb{C}$ is analogical, but we only apply the *Reduce* procedure. Neither for $\mathbb{R}$ nor for $\mathbb{C}$ can we apply the *Resolve* procedure in Mathematica 6.0.1, as it yields wrong results, as presented below:

```
Resolve[Exists[{x}, x == 0 && x*x == 1], Reals]
True
Resolve[Exists[{x}, x == 0 && x*x == 1], Complexes]
True
```

The number $2+273^2$ is prime.

Theorem 2. If $k \in \mathbb{Z} \cap [273, \infty)$ and $2+k^2$ is prime, then Conjecture 1 fails for $n = 6$ and the ring $\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{2+k^2}] = \{\frac{x}{(2+k^2)^m} : \ x \in \mathbb{Z}, m \in \mathbb{Z} \cap [0,\infty)\}$.

Proof. $(1, 2, k, k^2, 2+k^2, \frac{1}{2+k^2})$ solves the system

$$\begin{cases} x_1 &= 1 \\ x_1 + x_1 &= x_2 \\ x_3 \cdot x_3 &= x_4 \\ x_2 + x_4 &= x_5 \\ x_5 \cdot x_6 &= x_1 \end{cases}$$

Assume that $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6) \in (\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{2+k^2}])^6$ solves the system. Let $x_5 = \frac{a}{(2+k^2)^p}$, $x_6 = \frac{b}{(2+k^2)^q}$, $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$, $p, q \in \mathbb{Z} \cap [0,\infty)$. Since $2+k^2$ is prime and $1 = |x_1| = |x_5 \cdot x_6| = \frac{|a| \cdot |b|}{(2+k^2)^{p+q}}$, we conclude that $|a| = (2+k^2)^{\widetilde{p}}$ for some $\widetilde{p} \in \mathbb{Z} \cap [0,\infty)$. Hence $|x_5| = (2+k^2)^{\widetilde{p}-p}$. On the other hand, $|x_5| = |x_2 + x_4| = |x_1 + x_1 + x_3 \cdot x_3| = |1 + 1 + x_3^2| \geq 2$. Therefore, $\widetilde{p} - p \geq 1$. Consequently, $|x_5| = (2+k^2)^{\widetilde{p}-p} \geq 2 + k^2 > 2^{2^{6-2}}$.

□

Lemma 1 is a special case of the result presented in [16, p. 3].

Lemma 1. For each non-zero integer x there exist integers a, b such that $ax = (2b-1)(3b-1)$.

Proof. Write x as $(2y-1) \cdot 2^m$, where $y \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z} \cap [0,\infty)$. Obviously, $\dfrac{2^{2m+1}+1}{3} \in \mathbb{Z}$. By Chinese Remainder Theorem we can find an integer b such that $b \equiv y \pmod{2y-1}$ and $b \equiv \dfrac{2^{2m+1}+1}{3} \pmod{2^m}$. Thus, $\dfrac{2b-1}{2y-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\dfrac{3b-1}{2^m} \in \mathbb{Z}$. Hence $\dfrac{(2b-1)(3b-1)}{x} = \dfrac{2b-1}{2y-1} \cdot \dfrac{3b-1}{2^m} \in \mathbb{Z}$.

□

Theorem 3. If a prime number p is greater than 2^{256}, then Conjecture 1 fails for $n = 10$ and the ring $\mathbb{Z}\left[\frac{1}{p}\right]$.

Proof. Let us consider the system

$$\begin{cases} x_1 &= 1 \\ x_2 \cdot x_3 &= x_1 \\ x_3 + x_4 &= x_2 \\ x_4 \cdot x_5 &= x_6 \\ x_7 + x_7 &= x_8 \\ x_1 + x_9 &= x_8 \\ x_7 + x_9 &= x_{10} \\ x_9 \cdot x_{10} &= x_6 \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 1 there exist integers u, s such that $(p^2-1) \cdot u = (2s-1)(3s-1)$. Hence

$$(1,\ p,\ \tfrac{1}{p},\ p - \tfrac{1}{p},\ p \cdot u,\ (p^2-1) \cdot u,\ s,\ 2s,\ 2s-1,\ 3s-1) \in \left(\mathbb{Z}\left[\tfrac{1}{p}\right]\right)^{10}$$

solves the system. If $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6, x_7, x_8, x_9, x_{10}) \in \left(\mathbb{Z}\left[\frac{1}{p}\right]\right)^{10}$ solves the system, then $(x_2 - x_3) \cdot x_5 = (2x_7 - 1)(3x_7 - 1)$. Since $2x_7 - 1 \neq 0$ and $3x_7 - 1 \neq 0$, we get $x_2 \neq x_3$. Since $x_2 \cdot x_3 = 1$, we get: $|x_2| = p^n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z} \cap [1, \infty)$ or $|x_3| = p^n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z} \cap [1, \infty)$. Therefore, $|x_2| \geq p > 2^{2^{10-2}}$ or $|x_3| \geq p > 2^{2^{10-2}}$.

□

The number $-2^{32} - 2^{16} - 1$ is square-free, because $-3 \cdot 7 \cdot 13 \cdot 97 \cdot 241 \cdot 673$ is the factorization of $-2^{32} - 2^{16} - 1$ into prime numbers.

Theorem 4. Conjecture 1 fails for $n = 6$ and the ring $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-2^{32} - 2^{16} - 1}] = \{x + y \cdot \sqrt{-2^{32} - 2^{16} - 1} :\ x, y \in \mathbb{Z}\}$.

Proof. $(1, 2^{16} + 1, -2^{16}, -2^{32} - 2^{16}, \sqrt{-2^{32} - 2^{16} - 1}, -2^{32} - 2^{16} - 1)$ solves the system

$$\begin{cases} x_1 &= 1 \\ x_2 + x_3 &= x_1 \\ x_2 \cdot x_3 &= x_4 \\ x_5 \cdot x_5 &= x_6 \\ x_1 + x_6 &= x_4 \end{cases}$$

which has no integer solutions. For each $z \in \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-2^{32} - 2^{16} - 1}]$, if $|z| \leq 2^{2^{6-2}}$ then $z \in \mathbb{Z}$.

□

Observation 2. If $q, a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}$, $b \neq 0$ or $d \neq 0$, $q \geq 2$, q is square-free, and $(a + b\sqrt{q}) \cdot (c + d\sqrt{q}) = 1$, then

$$(a \geq 1 \wedge b \geq 1) \vee (a \leq -1 \wedge b \leq -1) \vee (c \geq 1 \wedge d \geq 1) \vee (c \leq -1 \wedge d \leq -1)$$

The number $4 \cdot 13^4 - 1$ is square-free, because $3 \cdot 113 \cdot 337$ is the factorization of $4 \cdot 13^4 - 1$ into prime numbers.

Theorem 5. If $p \in \mathbb{Z} \cap [13, \infty)$ and $4p^4 - 1$ is square-free, then Conjecture 1 fails for $n = 5$ and the ring $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{4p^4 - 1}] = \{x + y \cdot \sqrt{4p^4 - 1} : \ x, y \in \mathbb{Z}\}$.

Proof. $(1, 2p^2 + \sqrt{4p^4 - 1}, 2p^2 - \sqrt{4p^4 - 1}, 4p^2, 2p)$ solves the system

$$\begin{cases} x_1 &= 1 \\ x_2 \cdot x_3 &= x_1 \\ x_2 + x_3 &= x_4 \\ x_5 \cdot x_5 &= x_4 \end{cases}$$

Assume that $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5) \in (\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{4p^4 - 1}])^5$ solves the system. Let $x_2 = a + b\sqrt{4p^4 - 1}$, $x_3 = c + d\sqrt{4p^4 - 1}$, $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since

$$\neg(\exists x_2 \in \mathbb{Z} \ \exists x_3 \in \mathbb{Z} \ \exists x_5 \in \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{4p^4 - 1}] \ (x_2 \cdot x_3 = 1 \wedge x_2 + x_3 = x_5^2)),$$

$b \neq 0$ or $d \neq 0$. Since $x_2 \cdot x_3 = 1$, Observation 2 implies that $|x_2| \geq 1 + \sqrt{4p^4 - 1} > 2^{2^{5-2}}$ or $|x_3| \geq 1 + \sqrt{4p^4 - 1} > 2^{2^{5-2}}$.

□

Theorem 6. Let $f(x, y) \in \mathbb{Q}[x, y]$ and the equation $f(x, y) = 0$ defines an irreducible algebraic curve of genus greater than 1. Let some $r \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfies

$$(*) \ (-\infty, r) \subseteq \{x \in \mathbb{R} : \ \exists y \in \mathbb{R} \ f(x, y) = 0\} \vee (r, \infty) \subseteq \{x \in \mathbb{R} : \ \exists y \in \mathbb{R} \ f(x, y) = 0\}$$

and let $\boldsymbol{K}$ denote the function field over $\mathbb{Q}$ defined by $f(x, y) = 0$. Then Conjecture 1 fails for some subfield of $\mathbb{R}$ that is isomorphic to $\boldsymbol{K}$.

Proof. By Faltings' finiteness theorem ([6], cf. [11, p. 12]) the set

$$\{u \in \boldsymbol{K} : \ \exists v \in \boldsymbol{K} \ f(u, v) = 0\}$$

is finite. Let card $\{u \in \boldsymbol{K} : \ \exists v \in \boldsymbol{K} \ f(u, v) = 0\} = n \geq 1$, and let $\mathcal{U}$ denote the following system of equations

$$\begin{cases} f(x_i, y_i) &=& 0 \ \ (1 \leq i \leq n) \\ x_i + t_{i,j} &=& x_j \ \ \ (1 \leq i < j \leq n) \\ t_{i,j} \cdot s_{i,j} &=& 1 \ \ (1 \leq i < j \leq n) \\ x_{n+1} &=& \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} x_i^2 \end{cases}$$

For some integer $m > n$ there exists a set $\mathcal{G}$ of m variables such that

$$\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\, x_{n+1}, y_1, \ldots, y_n\} \cup \{t_{i,j}, s_{i,j}: \ 1 \leq i < j \leq n\} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$$

and the system $\mathcal{U}$ can be equivalently write down as a system $\mathcal{V}$ which contains only equations of the form $X = 1$, $X + Y = Z$, $X \cdot Y = Z$, where $X, Y, Z \in \mathcal{G}$. By $(*)$, we find $\widetilde{x}, \widetilde{y} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(\widetilde{x}, \widetilde{y}) = 0$, $\widetilde{x}$ is transcendental over $\mathbb{Q}$, and $|\widetilde{x}| > 2^{2^{m-3}}$. If $(\widehat{x_1}, \ldots, \widehat{x_m}) \in (\mathbb{Q}(\widetilde{x}, \widetilde{y}))^m$ solves $\mathcal{V}$, then

$$\widehat{x_{n+1}} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \widehat{x_i}^2 \geq \widetilde{x}^2 > (2^{2^{m-3}})^2 = 2^{2^{m-2}}$$

Obviously, $\boldsymbol{K}$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Q}(\widetilde{x}, \widetilde{y})$.

□

Conjecture 1 fails for some subfield of $\mathbb{R}$ and $n = 7$. We sketch the proof here. We find $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\alpha^2 \cdot \beta \cdot (1 - \alpha^2 - \beta) = 1$, α is transcendental over $\mathbb{Q}$, and $|\alpha| > 2^{2^{7-2}}$. It is known ([15]) that the equation $x + y + z = xyz = 1$ has no rational solution. Applying this, we prove: if $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6, x_7) \in \mathbb{Q}(\alpha, \beta)^7$ solves the system

$$\begin{cases} x_1 &=& 1 \\ x_2 \cdot x_2 &=& x_3 \\ x_3 + x_4 &=& x_5 \\ x_5 + x_6 &=& x_1 \\ x_3 \cdot x_4 &=& x_7 \\ x_6 \cdot x_7 &=& x_1 \end{cases}$$

then $|x_2| = |\alpha| > 2^{2^{7-2}}$.

For each $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}$ $(\mathbb{C})$ we define $S(a, b, c)$ as

$$\{\mathcal{E} \in E_3 : \ \mathcal{E} \text{ is satisfied under the substitution } [x_1 \to a, \ x_2 \to b, \ x_3 \to c]\}$$

If $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\{a\} \cup \{b\} \cup \{c\} \in \mathcal{W}$, then the system $S(a, b, c)$ is consistent over $\mathbb{R}$, has a finite number of real solutions, and each real solution of $S(a, b, c)$ belongs to $[-4, 4]^3$. The family

$$\{S(a,b,c) :\ a, b, c \in \mathbb{R} \ \wedge \ \{a\} \cup \{b\} \cup \{c\} \in \mathcal{W}\}$$

equals to the family of all systems $S \subseteq E_3$ which are consistent over $\mathbb{R}$ and maximal with respect to inclusion.

If $a, b, c \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\{a\} \cup \{b\} \cup \{c\} \in \mathcal{W} \cup \left\{\left\{1, \frac{-1+\sqrt{-3}}{2}, \frac{1+\sqrt{-3}}{2}\right\}, \left\{1, \frac{1-\sqrt{-3}}{2}, \frac{1+\sqrt{-3}}{2}\right\}\right\}$, then the system $S(a, b, c)$ is consistent over $\mathbb{C}$, has a finite number of solutions, and each solution of $S(a, b, c)$ belongs to $\{(z_1, z_2, z_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3 :\ |z_1| \leq 4 \wedge |z_2| \leq 4 \wedge |z_3| \leq 4\}$. The family

$$\{S(a,b,c) :\ a, b, c \in \mathbb{C} \ \wedge \ \{a\} \cup \{b\} \cup \{c\} \in$$
$$\mathcal{W} \cup \left\{\left\{1, \tfrac{-1+\sqrt{-3}}{2}, \tfrac{1+\sqrt{-3}}{2}\right\}, \left\{1, \tfrac{1-\sqrt{-3}}{2}, \tfrac{1+\sqrt{-3}}{2}\right\}\right\}\}$$

equals to the family of all systems $S \subseteq E_3$ which are consistent over $\mathbb{C}$ and maximal with respect to inclusion.

Let us consider the following four conjectures, analogical conjectures seem to be true for $\mathbb{R}$.

(21a) If a system $S \subseteq E_n$ is consistent over $\mathbb{C}$ and maximal with respect to inclusion, then each solution of S belongs to
$\{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n :\ |x_1| \leq 2^{2^{n-2}} \ \wedge \ \dots \ \wedge \ |x_n| \leq 2^{2^{n-2}}\}$.

(21b) If a system $S \subseteq E_n$ is consistent over $\mathbb{C}$ and maximal with respect to inclusion, then S has a finite number of solutions $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$.

(21c) If the equation $x_1 = 1$ belongs to $S \subseteq E_n$ and S has a finite number of complex solutions $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, then each such solution belongs to
$\{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n :\ |x_1| \leq 2^{2^{n-2}} \ \wedge \ \dots \ \wedge \ |x_n| \leq 2^{2^{n-2}}\}$.

(21d) If a system $S \subseteq E_n$ has a finite number of complex solutions $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, then each such solution belongs to
$\{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n :\ |x_1| \leq 2^{2^{n-1}} \ \wedge \ \dots \ \wedge \ |x_n| \leq 2^{2^{n-1}}\}$.

Conjecture 21a strengthens Conjecture 1 for $\mathbb{C}$. The conjunction of Conjectures 21b and 21c implies Conjecture 21a.

Concerning Conjecture 21d, for $n = 1$ estimation by $2^{2^{n-1}}$ can be replaced by estimation by 1. For $n > 1$ estimation by $2^{2^{n-1}}$ is the best estimation. Indeed, the system

$$\begin{cases} x_1 + x_1 &= x_2 \\ x_1 \cdot x_1 &= x_2 \\ x_2 \cdot x_2 &= x_3 \\ x_3 \cdot x_3 &= x_4 \\ & \dots \\ x_{n-1} \cdot x_{n-1} &= x_n \end{cases}$$

has precisely two complex solutions, $(0, \dots, 0)$, $(2, 4, 16, 256, \dots, 2^{2^{n-2}}, 2^{2^{n-1}})$.

The following code in *MuPAD* yields a probabilistic confirmation of Conjectures 21b and 21c. The value of n is set, for example, to 5. The number of iterations is set, for example, to 1000.

```
SEED:=time():
p:=[v-1,x-1,y-1,z-1]:
var:=[1,v,x,y,z]:
for i from 1 to 5 do
for j from i to 5 do
for k from 1 to 5 do
p:=append(p,var[i]+var[j]-var[k]):
p:=append(p,var[i]*var[j]-var[k]):
end_for:
end_for:
end_for:
p:=listlib::removeDuplicates(p):
max_abs_value:=1:
for r from 1 to 1000 do
q:=combinat::permutations::random(p):
syst:=[t-v-x-y-z]:
w:=1:
repeat
if groebner::dimension(append(syst,q[w]))>-1
then syst:=append(syst,q[w]) end_if:
```

```
w:=w+1:
until (groebner::dimension(syst)=0 or w>nops(q)) end:
d:=groebner::dimension(syst):
if d>0 then print("Conjecture 21b is false") end_if:
if d=0 then
sol:=numeric::solve(syst):
for m from 1 to nops(sol) do
for n from 2 to 5 do
max_abs_value:=max(max_abs_value,abs(sol[m][n][2])):
end_for:
end_for:
end_if:
print(max_abs_value);
end_for:
```

If we replace

```
p:=[v-1,x-1,y-1,z-1]:     by    p:=[]:
var:=[1,v,x,y,z]:         by    var:=[u,v,x,y,z]:
max_abs_value:=1:         by    max_abs_value:=0:
syst:=[t-v-x-y-z]:        by    syst:=[t-u-v-x-y-z]:
for n from 2 to 5 do      by    for n from 2 to 6 do
```

then we get a code for a probabilistic confirmation of Conjecture 21d.

We can formulate Conjecture 1 as follows: for each $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}$ ($\mathbb{C}$) there exist $y_1, \ldots, y_n \in \mathbb{R}$ ($\mathbb{C}$) such that

$$\forall i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \ |y_i| \leq 2^{2^{n-2}}$$
$$\forall i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \ (x_i = 1 \Rightarrow y_i = 1)$$
$$\forall i, j, k \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \ (x_i + x_j = x_k \Rightarrow y_i + y_j = y_k)$$
$$\forall i, j, k \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \ (x_i \cdot x_j = x_k \Rightarrow y_i \cdot y_j = y_k)$$

We say that $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ ($\mathbb{C}$) has a property $\mathcal{B}$, if for each $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in X$ there exist $y_1, \ldots, y_n \in X$ with the above four properties. We define:

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}} = \{X \subseteq \mathbb{R} : \ X \text{ has property } \mathcal{B}\}$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{C}} = \{X \subseteq \mathbb{C} : \ X \text{ has property } \mathcal{B}\}$$

If $X \subseteq [-\sqrt{2},\ \sqrt{2}]$ then $X \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}}$. If $X \subseteq \{z \in \mathbb{C}:\ |z| \leq \sqrt{2}\}$ then $X \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{C}}$.

Theorem 7. The family $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}}$ ($\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{C}}$) has a maximal element.

Proof. We prove: if $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is a chain, then $\bigcup\limits_{X \in \mathcal{C}} X \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}}$. Since $\mathcal{C}$ is a chain, for each $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \bigcup\limits_{X \in \mathcal{C}} X$ there exists $X \in \mathcal{C}$ with $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in X$. Since X has property $\mathcal{B}$, we obtain suitable $y_1, \ldots, y_n \in X \cap [-2^{2^{n-2}},\ 2^{2^{n-2}}] \subseteq \left(\bigcup\limits_{X \in \mathcal{C}} X\right) \cap [-2^{2^{n-2}},\ 2^{2^{n-2}}]$. We have proved that $\bigcup\limits_{X \in \mathcal{C}} X \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}}$. By Zorn's lemma, the family $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}}$ has a maximal element. The proof for $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{C}}$ is analogical.

$\square$

It is hardly to decide whether Theorem 7 may help prove that $\mathbb{R} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $\mathbb{C} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{C}}$.

Conjecture 2 strengthens Conjecture 1.

Conjecture 2. For each $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}$ ($\mathbb{C}$) there exist $y_1, \ldots, y_n \in \mathbb{R}$ ($\mathbb{C}$) such that

$$\begin{gathered}
\forall i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\ |y_i| \leq 2^{2^{n-2}} \\
\forall i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\ |y_i - 1| \leq |x_i - 1| \\
\forall i, j, k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\ |y_i + y_j - y_k| \leq |x_i + x_j - x_k| \\
\forall i, j, k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\ |y_i \cdot y_j - y_k| \leq |x_i \cdot x_j - x_k|
\end{gathered}$$

Since $(\mathbb{R}, +, \cdot, 0, 1, =, \leq)$ is decidable, Conjectures 1 and 2 for $\mathbb{R}$ are decidable for each fixed n. For a fixed n, Conjecture 1 for $\mathbb{C}$ (Conjecture 2 for $\mathbb{C}$) can be translated into the sentence involving $2n$ real numbers. Since $(\mathbb{R}, +, \cdot, 0, 1, =, \leq)$ is decidable, Conjectures 1 and 2 for $\mathbb{C}$ are decidable for each fixed n.

Hilbert's tenth problem is to give a computing algorithm which will tell of a given polynomial equation with integer coefficients whether or not it has a solution in integers. Yu. V. Matijasevič proved ([13]) that there is no such algorithm, see also [14], [3], [4], [9]. It implies that Conjecture 1 is false for $\mathbb{Z}$ instead of $\mathbb{R}$ ($\mathbb{C}$). Moreover, Matijasevič's theorem implies that Conjecture 1 for $\mathbb{Z}$ is false with any other computable estimation instead of $2^{2^{n-2}}$, so each χ in item **(1)** is not computable.

As we have proved Conjecture 1 for $\mathbb{Z}$ is false. We describe a counterexample showing that Conjecture 1 for $\mathbb{Z}$ is false with $n = 21$.

Lemma 2 ([8, Lemma 2.3, p. 451]). For each $x \in \mathbb{Z} \cap [2, \infty)$ there exists $y \in \mathbb{Z} \cap [1, \infty)$ such that $1 + x^3(2 + x)y^2$ is a square.

Lemma 3 ([8, Lemma 2.3, p. 451]). For each $x \in \mathbb{Z} \cap [2, \infty)$, $y \in \mathbb{Z} \cap [1, \infty)$, if $1 + x^3(2 + x)y^2$ is a square, then $y \geq x + x^{x-2}$.

Let us consider the following system over $\mathbb{Z}$. This system consists of two subsystems.

$$
\begin{array}{lllll}
(\bullet) & x_1 = 1 & x_1 + x_1 = x_2 & x_2 \cdot x_2 = x_3 & x_3 \cdot x_3 = x_4 \\
& x_4 \cdot x_4 = x_5 & x_5 \cdot x_5 = x_6 & x_6 \cdot x_6 = x_7 & x_6 \cdot x_7 = x_8 \\
& x_2 + x_6 = x_9 & x_8 \cdot x_9 = x_{10} & x_{11} \cdot x_{11} = x_{12} & x_{10} \cdot x_{12} = x_{13} \\
& x_1 + x_{13} = x_{14} & x_{15} \cdot x_{15} = x_{14} & &
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{lllll}
(\diamond) & x_{16} + x_{16} = x_{17} & x_1 + x_{18} = x_{17} & x_{16} + x_{18} = x_{19} & x_{18} \cdot x_{19} = x_{20} \\
& x_{12} \cdot x_{21} = x_{20} & & &
\end{array}
$$

Since $x_1 = 1$ and $x_{12} = x_{11} \cdot x_{11}$, the subsystem marked with $(\diamond)$ is equivalent to

$$x_{21} \cdot x_{11}^2 = (2x_{16} - 1)(3x_{16} - 1)$$

The subsystem marked with $(\bullet)$ is equivalent to

$$x_{15}^2 = 1 + (2^{16})^3 \cdot (2 + 2^{16}) \cdot x_{11}^2$$

By Lemma 2 the last equation has a solution $(x_{11}, x_{15}) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that $x_{11} \geq 1$. By Lemma 1 we can find integers x_{16}, x_{21} satisfying $x_{21} \cdot x_{11}^2 = (2x_{16} - 1)(3x_{16} - 1)$. Thus, the whole system is consistent over $\mathbb{Z}$.

If $(x_1, \ldots, x_{21}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{21}$ solves the whole system, then $x_{15}^2 = 1 + (2^{16})^3 \cdot (2 + 2^{16}) \cdot |x_{11}|^2$ and $x_{21} \cdot |x_{11}|^2 = (2x_{16} - 1)(3x_{16} - 1)$. Since $2x_{16} - 1 \neq 0$ and $3x_{16} - 1 \neq 0$, $|x_{11}| \geq 1$. By Lemma 3

$$|x_{11}| \geq 2^{16} + (2^{16})^{2^{16} - 2} > (2^{16})^{2^{16} - 2} = 2^{2^{20} - 32} > 2^{2^{21-2}}$$

Theorem 8. If $\mathbb{Z}$ is definable in $\mathbb{Q}$ by an existential formula, then Conjecture 1 fails for $\mathbb{Q}$.

Proof. If $\mathbb{Z}$ is definable in $\mathbb{Q}$ by an existential formula, then $\mathbb{Z}$ is definable in $\mathbb{Q}$ by a Diophantine formula. Let

$$\forall x_1 \in \mathbb{Q} \ (x_1 \in \mathbb{Z} \Leftrightarrow \exists x_2 \in \mathbb{Q} \ldots \exists x_m \in \mathbb{Q} \ \Phi(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m))$$

where $\Phi(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m)$ is a conjunction of the formulae of the form $x_i = 1$, $x_i + x_j = x_k$, $x_i \cdot x_j = x_k$, where $i, j, k \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$. We find an integer n with $2^n \geq m + 10$. Now we are ready to describe a counterexample to Conjecture 1 for $\mathbb{Q}$, this counterexample uses $n+m+11$ variables. Considering all equations over $\mathbb{Q}$, we can equivalently write down the system

$$\begin{cases} \Phi(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m) & (1) \\ x_{m+2}^2 = 1 + \left(2^{2^n}\right)^3 \cdot (2 + 2^{2^n}) \cdot x_1^2 & (2) \\ x_1 \cdot x_{m+1} = 1 & (3) \end{cases}$$

as a conjunction of the formulae of the form $x_i = 1$, $x_i + x_j = x_k$, $x_i \cdot x_j = x_k$, where $i, j, k \in \{1, \ldots, n+m+11\}$. The system is consistent over $\mathbb{Q}$. Assume that $(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+m+11}) \in \mathbb{Q}^{n+m+11}$ solves the system. Formula (1) implies that $x_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$. By this and equation (2), $x_{m+2} \in \mathbb{Z}$. Equation (3) implies that $x_1 \neq 0$, so by Lemma 3

$$|x_1| \geq 2^{2^n} + (2^{2^n})^{2^{2^n}} - 2 > 2^{2^{n + 2^n} - 2^{n+1}} \geq 2^{2^{n+2^n-1}} \geq 2^{2^{n+m+11-2}}$$

□

Question. For which $n \in \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\}$ there exists a continuous function

$$\mathbb{R}^n \ni (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \xrightarrow{f_n} (f_{(n,1)}(x_1, \ldots, x_n), \ldots, f_{(n,n)}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)) \in [-2^{2^{n-2}},\ 2^{2^{n-2}}]^n$$

such that

$$\forall (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \ \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \ (x_i = 1 \Rightarrow f_{(n,i)}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = 1)$$

$$\forall (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \ \forall i, j, k \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \ (x_i + x_j = x_k \Rightarrow \\ f_{(n,i)}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) + f_{(n,j)}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = f_{(n,k)}(x_1, \ldots, x_n))$$

$$\forall (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \ \forall i, j, k \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \ (x_i \cdot x_j = x_k \Rightarrow \\ f_{(n,i)}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \cdot f_{(n,j)}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = f_{(n,k)}(x_1, \ldots, x_n))$$

Theorem 9. Such functions exist for $n = 1$ and $n = 2$.

Proof. Case $n = 1$. We define $f_1 : \mathbb{R} \to [0, 1]$ by

$$f_1(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if} \quad x \in (-\infty, 0) \\ x & \text{if} \quad x \in [0, 1] \\ 1 & \text{if} \quad x \in (1, \infty) \end{cases}$$

Case $n = 2$. Let A be a closed subset of a metric space X and let X be a locally convex topological linear space. The Dugundji theorem ([5]) states that every continuous map $f : A \to X$ can be extended continuously to all of X in such a way that the range of the extension lies in the convex hull of $f(A)$. Applying the Dugundji theorem we find a continuous function $f_2 : \mathbb{R}^2 \to [-2,2]^2$ with the following properties:

$$\forall x, y \in [-2,2]\ f_2(x,y) = (x,y)$$

$$\begin{array}{rlcllcl}
\forall x \in (-\infty,-2) & (f_2(x,1) & = & (-2,1) & \wedge & f_2(1,x) & = & (1,-2)) \\
\forall x \in (2,\infty) & (f_2(x,1) & = & (2,1) & \wedge & f_2(1,x) & = & (1,2)) \\
\forall x \in (-\infty,-2) & (f_2(x,0) & = & (-2,0) & \wedge & f_2(0,x) & = & (0,-2)) \\
\forall x \in (2,\infty) & (f_2(x,0) & = & (2,0) & \wedge & f_2(0,x) & = & (0,2)) \\
\forall x \in (-\infty,-1) & (f_2(x,2x) & = & (-1,-2) & \wedge & f_2(2x,x) & = & (-2,-1)) \\
\forall x \in (1,2] & (f_2(x,2x) & = & (2-x,4-2x) & \wedge & f_2(2x,x) & = & (4-2x,2-x)) \\
\forall x \in (2,\infty) & (f_2(x,2x) & = & (0,0) & \wedge & f_2(2x,x) & = & (0,0)) \\
\forall x \in (-\infty,-\sqrt{2}) & (f_2(x,x^2) & = & (-\sqrt{2},2) & \wedge & f_2(x^2,x) & = & (2,-\sqrt{2})) \\
\forall x \in (\sqrt{2},2] & (f_2(x,x^2) & = & (\sqrt{4-x^2},4-x^2) & \wedge & f_2(x^2,x) & = & (4-x^2,\sqrt{4-x^2})) \\
\forall x \in (2,\infty) & (f_2(x,x^2) & = & (0,0) & \wedge & f_2(x^2,x) & = & (0,0))
\end{array}$$

We propose an effective description of a continuous $f_2 : \mathbb{R}^2 \to [-2,2]^2$. We define $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \to [-2,2]$ by

$$\sigma(x) = \begin{cases} -2 & \text{if} \quad x \in (-\infty,-2) \\ x & \text{if} \quad x \in [-2,2] \\ 2 & \text{if} \quad x \in (2,\infty) \end{cases}$$

Let

$$T = [-2,2]^2 \cup$$

$$\{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 :\ y = 1 \vee x = 1 \vee y = 0 \vee x = 0 \vee y = 2x \vee x = 2y \vee y = x^2 \vee x = y^2\}$$

Let $\rho : \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus T \to (0,\infty)$ be defined by

$$\rho(x,y) = \frac{1}{|x-\sigma(x)| + |y-\sigma(y)|} +$$

$$\frac{1}{|y-1|} + \frac{1}{|x-1|} + \frac{1}{|y-0|} + \frac{1}{|x-0|} + \frac{1}{|y-2x|} + \frac{1}{|x-2y|} + \frac{1}{|y-x^2|} + \frac{1}{|x-y^2|}$$

and let $g : \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus T \to [-2,2]^2$ be defined by

$$g(x,y) = \frac{1}{\rho(x,y)} \cdot \left(\frac{f_2(\sigma(x),\sigma(y))}{|x-\sigma(x)| + |y-\sigma(y)|} + \right.$$

$$\left. \frac{f_2(x,1)}{|y-1|} + \frac{f_2(1,y)}{|x-1|} + \frac{f_2(x,0)}{|y-0|} + \frac{f_2(0,y)}{|x-0|} + \frac{f_2(x,2x)}{|y-2x|} + \frac{f_2(2y,y)}{|x-2y|} + \frac{f_2(x,x^2)}{|y-x^2|} + \frac{f_2(y^2,y)}{|x-y^2|} \right)$$

Let $f_2|T$ denote f_2 restricted to T. The function f_2 has an exact definition on T, and $(f_2|T) \cup g : \mathbb{R}^2 \to [-2,2]^2$ is continuous.

$\square$

Let $\boldsymbol{K}$ be a ring and let $A \subseteq \boldsymbol{K}$. We say that a map $f : A \to \boldsymbol{K}$ is *arithmetic* if it satisfies the following conditions:
if $1 \in A$ then $f(1) = 1$,
if $a, b \in A$ and $a + b \in A$ then $f(a+b) = f(a) + f(b)$,
if $a, b \in A$ and $a \cdot b \in A$ then $f(a \cdot b) = f(a) \cdot f(b)$.

We call an element $r \in \boldsymbol{K}$ *arithmetically fixed* if there is a finite set $A \subseteq \boldsymbol{K}$ (an *arithmetic neighbourhood* of r inside $\boldsymbol{K}$) with $r \in A$ such that each arithmetic map $f : A \to \boldsymbol{K}$ fixes r, i.e. $f(r) = r$. If $\boldsymbol{K}$ is a field, then any $r \in \boldsymbol{K}$ is arithmetically fixed if and only if $\{r\}$ is existentially first-order definable in the language of rings without parameters, see [18]. Articles [17], [12], [18] dealt with a description of a situation where for an element in a field there exists an arithmetic neighbourhood. Article [19] describes various types of arithmetic neighbourhoods inside $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$.

Let $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{K}}$ denote the set of all $r \in \boldsymbol{K}$ that are arithmetically fixed. Let $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{K}}_n$ $(n = 1, 2, 3, \ldots)$ denote the set of all $r \in \boldsymbol{K}$ for which there exists an arithmetic neighbourhood A of r such that $\mathrm{card}(A) \leq n$. Obviously, $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{K}}_1 = \{0, 1\}$ and $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{K}}_2 \in \left\{\{0,1\}, \{0,1,2\}, \{0,1,2,\frac{1}{2}\}\right\}$.

By Theorem 3 in [17] $\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_n \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathrm{alg}} = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x \text{ is algebraic over } \mathbb{Q}\}$. By this, Conjecture 1 implies $\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_n \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathrm{alg}} \cap [-2^{2^{n-2}},\ 2^{2^{n-2}}]$. By Corollary 2 in [17] $\widetilde{\mathbb{C}}_n \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$. By this, Conjecture 1 implies $\widetilde{\mathbb{C}}_n \subseteq \mathbb{Q} \cap [-2^{2^{n-2}},\ 2^{2^{n-2}}]$.

Theorem 10 (cf. [17]). For each $n \in \{3, 4, 5, \ldots\}$ we have $\mathrm{card}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{K}}_n) \leq (n+1)^{n^2+n} + 2$.

Proof. If $\mathrm{card}(\boldsymbol{K}) < n$ then $\mathrm{card}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{K}}_n) \leq \mathrm{card}(\boldsymbol{K}) < n < (n+1)^{n^2+n} + 2$. In the rest of the proof we assume that $\mathrm{card}(\boldsymbol{K}) \geq n$. Let $r \in \widetilde{\boldsymbol{K}}_n \setminus \{0, 1\}$ and A is a neighbourhood of r such that $\mathrm{card}(A) \leq n$. Then each set B with $A \subseteq B \subseteq \boldsymbol{K}$ and $\mathrm{card}(B) = n$ is a neighbourhood of r. Observe that $1 \in B$, because in the opposite case the arithmetic map $B \to \{0\}$ moves $r \neq 0$, which is impossible. Since $r \neq 1$, we can choose B with $\boldsymbol{K} \supseteq B = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \supseteq A$, where $x_1 = r$, $x_n = 1$, and $x_i \neq x_j$ if $i \neq j$. We choose all formulae $x_i + x_j = x_k$, $x_i \cdot x_j = x_k$ $(1 \leq i \leq j \leq n,\ 1 \leq k \leq n)$ that are satisfied in B. Joining these formulae with conjunctions we get some formula Φ. Let V denote the set of variables in $\Phi \wedge (x_n = 1)$. Observe that $x_1 \in V$, since otherwise for any $s \in \boldsymbol{K} \setminus \{r\}$ the mapping $f = \mathrm{id}(B \setminus \{r\}) \cup \{(r, s)\}$ satisfies conditions **(1)**-**(3)** and

$f(r) \neq r$. The formula $\underbrace{\ldots\ \exists x_i\ \ldots}_{x_i \in V,\ i \neq 1} (\Phi \wedge (x_n = 1))$ is satisfied in $\boldsymbol{K}$ if and only if $x_1 = r$.

For each $(i,j) \in \{(i,j) : 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n\}$ there are $n+1$ possibilities:

$$x_i + x_j = x_1, \quad \ldots, \quad x_i + x_j = x_n, \quad x_i + x_j \notin \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}.$$

For each $(i,j) \in \{(i,j) : 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n\}$ there are $n+1$ possibilities:

$$x_i \cdot x_j = x_1, \quad \ldots, \quad x_i \cdot x_j = x_n, \quad x_i \cdot x_j \notin \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}.$$

Since $\mathrm{card}(\{(i,j) : 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n\}) = \frac{n^2+n}{2}$, the number of possible formulae $\Phi \wedge (x_n = 1)$ does not exceed $(n+1)^{\frac{n^2+n}{2}} \cdot (n+1)^{\frac{n^2+n}{2}} = (n+1)^{n^2+n}$. Thus $\mathrm{card}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{K}}_n \setminus \{0,1\}) \leq (n+1)^{n^2+n}$, so $\mathrm{card}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{K}}_n) \leq (n+1)^{n^2+n} + 2$.

□

As we have seen in the proof of Theorem 10, each n-element arithmetic neighbourhood of $r \in \boldsymbol{K}$ determines a system of equations belonging to some non-empty subset of E_n. In the ring $\boldsymbol{K}$, for each solution of this system the value of variable x_1 is r.

Considering all systems $S \subseteq E_i$ $(i = 1,2,3)$ we get: $\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_1 = \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_1 = \widetilde{\mathbb{C}}_1 = \{0,1\}$, $\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_2 = \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_2 = \widetilde{\mathbb{C}}_2 = \{0,1,2,\frac{1}{2}\}$, $\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_3 = \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_3 = \widetilde{\mathbb{C}}_3 = \{0,1,2,\frac{1}{2},-1,3,4,-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{4},\frac{3}{2},-2,\frac{1}{3},\frac{2}{3}\}$.

For any ring $\boldsymbol{K}$ and any $r \in \widetilde{\boldsymbol{K}}$ we define $\omega(r) \in \{1,2,3,\ldots\}$ as

$$\min \{\mathrm{card}(A) :\ \{r\} \subseteq A \subseteq \boldsymbol{K} \wedge A \text{ is an arithmetic neighbourhood of } r \text{ inside } \boldsymbol{K}\}$$

As a corollary of Theorem 10 we obtain

$$\forall n \in \{3,4,5,\ldots\}\ \forall B \subseteq \widetilde{\boldsymbol{K}}\ \left(\mathrm{card}(B) > (n+1)^{n^2+n} + 2 \Longrightarrow \exists r \in B\ \omega(r) > n\right)$$

Obviously, each $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{K}}_n$ is finite (Theorem 8 gives a concrete upper bound for $\mathrm{card}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{K}}_n)$), so for any subring $\boldsymbol{K} \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ there exists $\lambda : \{1,2,3,\ldots\} \to \{1,2,3,\ldots\}$ such that

$$\forall n \in \{1,2,3,\ldots\}\ \forall z \in \widetilde{\boldsymbol{K}}_n\ |z| \leq \lambda(n)$$

The author does not know whether for $\boldsymbol{K} = \mathbb{Z}$ there exists a computable $\lambda : \{1,2,3,\ldots\} \to \{1,2,3,\ldots\}$ with the above property.

Conjecture 3. Let $\boldsymbol{G}$ be an additive subgroup of $\mathbb{C}$. Let S be a consistent system of equations in $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n \in \boldsymbol{G}$, where each equation in S is one of the following two forms: $x_i = 1$ or $x_i + x_j = x_k$. Then S has a solution $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \in (\boldsymbol{G} \cap \mathbb{Q})^n$ in which $|x_j| \leq 2^{n-1}$ for each j.

In case when $\boldsymbol{G} \supseteq \mathbb{Q}$ we will prove a weaker version of Conjecture 3 with the estimation given by $(\sqrt{5})^{n-1}$.

Observation 3. If $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^k$ is an affine subspace and card $\mathcal{A} > 1$, then there exists $m \in \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ with

$$\emptyset \neq \mathcal{A} \cap \{(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_k) \in \mathbb{C}^k : \ x_m + x_m = x_m\} \subsetneq \mathcal{A}$$

Theorem 11. Let S be a consistent system of equations in complex numbers $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n$, where each equation in S is one of the following two forms: $x_i = 1$ or $x_i + x_j = x_k$. Then S has a rational solution $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)$ in which $|x_j| \leq (\sqrt{5})^{n-1}$ for each j.

Proof. We shall describe how to find a solution $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{Q}^n$ in which $|x_j| \leq (\sqrt{5})^{n-1}$ for each j. We can assume that for a certain $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ the equation $x_i = 1$ belongs to S, as otherwise $(0, 0, \ldots, 0)$ is a solution. Without lost of generality we can assume that the equation $x_1 = 1$ belongs to S. Each equation belonging to S has a form

$$a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 + \ldots + a_n x_n = b,$$

where $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n, b \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $x_1 = 1$, we can equivalently write this equation as

$$a_2 x_2 + a_3 x_3 + \ldots + a_n x_n = b - a_1$$

We receive a system of equations whose set of solutions is a non-empty affine subspace $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$. If card $\mathcal{A} > 1$, then by Observation 3 we find $m \in \{2, 3, \ldots, n\}$ for which

$$\emptyset \neq \mathcal{A} \cap \{(x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{C}^{n-1} : \ x_m + x_m = x_m\} \subsetneq \mathcal{A}$$

The procedure described in the last sentence is applied to the affine subspace

$$\mathcal{A} \cap \{(x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{C}^{n-1} : \ x_m + x_m = x_m\}$$

and repeated until one point is achieved. The maximum number of procedure executions is $n - 1$. The received one-point affine subspace is described by equations belonging to a certain set

$$\mathcal{U} \subseteq \{x_i = 1 : \ i \in \{2, 3, \ldots, n\}\} \cup \{x_i + x_j = x_k : \ i, j, k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}, i + j + k > 3\}$$

Each equation belonging to $\mathcal{U}$ has a form

$$a_2 x_2 + a_3 x_3 + \ldots + a_n x_n = c,$$

where $a_2, a_3, \ldots, a_n, c \in \mathbb{Z}$. Among these equations, we choose $n-1$ linearly independent equations. Let $\mathbf{A}$ be the matrix of the system, and the system of equations has the following form

$$\mathbf{A} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} x_2 \\ x_3 \\ \vdots \\ x_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} c_2 \\ c_3 \\ \vdots \\ c_n \end{bmatrix}$$

Let $\mathbf{A}_j$ be the matrix formed by replacing the j-th column of $\mathbf{A}$ by the column vector $c_2, c_3, \ldots, c_n$. Obviously, $\det(\mathbf{A}) \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $\det(\mathbf{A}_j) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for each $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n-1\}$. By Cramer's rule $x_j = \frac{\det(\mathbf{A}_{j-1})}{\det(\mathbf{A})} \in \mathbb{Q}$ for each $j \in \{2, 3, \ldots, n\}$.

When the row of matrix $\mathbf{A}$ corresponds to the equation $x_i = 1$ $(i > 1)$, then the entries in the row are 1, 0 ($n-2$ times), while the right side of the equation is 1.

When the row of matrix $\mathbf{A}$ corresponds to the equation $x_1 + x_1 = x_i$ $(i > 1)$, then the entries in the row are 1, 0 ($n-2$ times), while the right side of the equation is 2.

When the row of matrix $\mathbf{A}$ corresponds to one of the equations: $x_1 + x_i = x_1$ or $x_i + x_1 = x_1$ $(i > 1)$, then the entries in the row are 1, 0 ($n-2$ times), while the right side of the equation is 0.

When the row of matrix $\mathbf{A}$ corresponds to one of the equations: $x_1 + x_i = x_j$ or $x_i + x_1 = x_j$ $(i > 1,\ j > 1,\ i \neq j)$, then the entries in the row are 1, -1, 0 ($n-3$ times), while the right side of the equation is 1.

When the row of matrix $\mathbf{A}$ corresponds to the equation $x_i + x_i = x_1$ $(i > 1)$, then the entries in the row are 2, 0 ($n-2$ times), while the right side of the equation is 1.

When the row of matrix $\mathbf{A}$ corresponds to the equation $x_i + x_j = x_1$ $(i > 1,\ j > 1,\ i \neq j)$, then the entries in the row are 1, 1, 0 ($n-3$ times), while the right side of the equation is 1.

From now on we assume that $i, j, k \in \{2, 3, \ldots, n\}$.

When the row of matrix $\mathbf{A}$ corresponds to the equation $x_i + x_j = x_k$ $(i \neq j,\ i \neq k,\ j \neq k)$, then the entries in the row are 1, 1, -1, 0 ($n-4$ times), while the right side of the equation is 0.

When the row of matrix $\mathbf{A}$ corresponds to the equation $x_i + x_i = x_k$ $(i \neq k)$, then the entries in the row are 2, -1, 0 ($n-3$ times), while the right side of the equation is 0.

When the row of matrix $\mathbf{A}$ corresponds to the equation $x_i + x_j = x_k$ ($k = i$ or $k = j$), then the entries in the row are 1, 0 ($n-2$ times), while the right side of the equation is 0.

Contradictory equations, e.g. $x_1 + x_i = x_i$ do not belong to $\mathcal{U}$, therefore their description has been disregarded. The presented description shows that each row of matrix $\mathbf{A}_j$ ($j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n-1\}$) has the length less than or equal to $\sqrt{5}$. By Hadamard's inequality $|\det(\mathbf{A}_j)| \leq (\sqrt{5})^{n-1}$ for each $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n-1\}$. Hence, $|x_j| = \frac{|\det(\mathbf{A}_{j-1})|}{|\det(\mathbf{A})|} \leq |\det(\mathbf{A}_{j-1})| \leq (\sqrt{5})^{n-1}$ for each $j \in \{2, 3, \ldots, n\}$.

□

Concerning the above proof, without lost of generality we can assume that all equations $x_i = 1$ ($i > 1$) do not belong to S. Indeed, if $i > 1$ and the equation $x_i = 1$ belongs to S, then we replace x_i by x_1 in all equations belonging to S. In this way the problem reduces to the same problem with a smaller number of variables. Therefore, for proving Theorem 11 (or any other bound) it is sufficient to consider only these systems S of n equations which have a unique solution $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ and contain the equation $x_1 = 1$ and $n-1$ equations of the form $x_i + x_j = x_k$ ($i, j, k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$). Let $\mathbf{B}$ be the matrix of the linear system consisting of the aforementioned $n-1$ equations of the form $x_i + x_j = x_k$. Let $\mathbf{A}$ be the matrix of the following linear system

$$x_1 = 1$$

$$\mathbf{B} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ \vdots \\ x_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

and let $\mathbf{B}_j$ be the matrix formed by deleting the j-th column of $\mathbf{B}$. By Cramer's rule $|x_j| = |\frac{\det(\mathbf{B}_j)}{\det(\mathbf{A})}| \leq |\det(\mathbf{B}_j)|$ for each $j \in \{2, 3, \ldots, n\}$. By this, the following Conjecture 4 implies Conjecture 3 for the case when $\boldsymbol{G} \supseteq \mathbb{Q}$.

Conjecture 4. Let $\mathbf{B}$ be a matrix with $n-1$ rows and n columns, $n \geq 2$. Assume that each row of $\mathbf{B}$, after deleting all zeros, forms a sequence belonging to

$$\{\langle 1 \rangle, \langle -1, 2 \rangle, \langle 2, -1 \rangle, \langle -1, 1, 1 \rangle, \langle 1, -1, 1 \rangle, \langle 1, 1, -1 \rangle\}$$

We conjecture that after deleting any column of $\mathbf{B}$ we get the matrix whose determinant has absolute value less than or equal to 2^{n-1}.

In case when $\boldsymbol{G} = \mathbb{R}$ ($\boldsymbol{G} = \mathbb{C}$) Conjecture 5 strengthens Conjecture 3.

Conjecture 5. For each $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}$ $(\mathbb{C})$ there exist $y_1, \dots, y_n \in \mathbb{R}$ $(\mathbb{C})$ such that

$$\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \ |y_i| \leq 2^{n-1}$$
$$\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \ |y_i - 1| \leq |x_i - 1|$$
$$\forall i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, n\} \ |y_i + y_j - y_k| \leq |x_i + x_j - x_k|$$

For a positive integer n we define the set of equations W_n by

$$W_n = \{x_i = 1 : \ 1 \leq i \leq n\} \ \cup \{x_i + x_j = x_k : \ 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n, \ 1 \leq k \leq n\}$$

If a system $S \subseteq W_n$ is consistent over $\mathbb{R}$ $(\mathbb{C})$ and maximal with respect to inclusion, then (cf. the proof of Theorem 11) S has a unique rational solution $(\widehat{x_1}, \dots, \widehat{x_n})$ given by Cramer's rule. Hence,

$$\text{Conjecture 3 for } \mathbb{R} \Longleftrightarrow \text{Conjecture 3 for } \mathbb{Q} \Longleftrightarrow \text{Conjecture 3 for } \mathbb{C}$$

Conjecture 3 holds true for each $n \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and each additive subgroup $\boldsymbol{G} \subseteq \mathbb{C}$. It follows from the following Observation 4.

Observation 4. Let $n \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, and let $S \subseteq W_n$ be a system that is consistent over the additive subgroup $\boldsymbol{G} \subseteq \mathbb{C}$. If $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \boldsymbol{G}^n$ solves S, then $(\widehat{x_1}, \dots, \widehat{x_n})$ solves S, where each $\widehat{x_i}$ is suitably chosen from $\{x_i, 0, 1, 2, \frac{1}{2}\} \cap \{z \in \boldsymbol{G} : \ |z| \leq 2^{n-1}\}$.

Multiple execution of the algorithm described in items **(22)**-**(23)** yields partial (as probabilistic) resolution of Conjecture 3 for $\mathbb{R}$ and $n \geq 2$. This algorithm resolves Conjecture 3 for some randomly chosen subsystem of W_n.

(22) We define by induction a finite sequence $(s_1, \dots, s_n)$ of equations belonging to $W_n \setminus \{x_i = 1 : \ 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. As s_1 we put the equation $x_1 + x_1 = x_1$. When $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and the sequence $(s_1, \dots, s_i)$ is defined, then as s_{i+1} we put the first randomly chosen $h \in W_n \setminus \{x_i = 1 : \ 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ for which the equations $s_1, \dots, s_i, h$ are linearly independent.

(23) We resolve Conjecture 3 for $\mathbb{R}$ for the system $\{x_1 = 1, s_2, \dots, s_n\}$. This system has a unique solution $(1, \widehat{x_2}, \dots, \widehat{x_n})$ given by Cramer's rule, $\widehat{x_2}, \dots, \widehat{x_n} \in \mathbb{Q}$.

The algorithm terminates with probability 1. For $n = 5$, the following code in *MuPAD* performs the algorithm with 1000 iterations.

```
SEED:=time():
r:=random(1..5):
idmatrix:=matrix::identity(5):
u:=linalg::row(idmatrix,i) $i=1..5:
max_norm:=1:
```

```
for k from 1 to 1000 do
a:=linalg::row(idmatrix,1):
rank:=1:
while rank<5 do
m:=matrix(u[r()])+matrix(u[r()])-matrix(u[r()]):
a1:=linalg::stackMatrix(a,m):
rank1:=linalg::rank(a1):
if rank1 > rank then a:=linalg::stackMatrix(a,m) end_if:
rank:=linalg::rank(a):
end_while:
x:=(a^-1)*linalg::col(idmatrix,1):
max_norm:=max(max_norm,norm(x)):
print(max_norm):
end_for:
```

For another algorithm, implemented in *Mathematica*, see [10].

In case when $\boldsymbol{G} = \mathbb{Z}$ we will prove a weaker version of Conjecture 3 with the estimation given by $(\sqrt{5})^{n-1}$.

Lemma 4 ([2]). Let $\mathbf{A}$ be a matrix with m rows, n columns, and integer entries. Let $b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_m \in \mathbb{Z}$, and the matrix equation

$$\mathbf{A} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ \vdots \\ x_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2 \\ \vdots \\ b_m \end{bmatrix}$$

defines the system of linear equations with rank m. Denote by δ the maximum of the absolute values of the $m \times m$ minors of the augmented matrix $(\mathbf{A}, b)$. We claim that if the system is consistent over $\mathbb{Z}$, then it has a solution in $(\mathbb{Z} \cap [-\delta, \delta])^n$.

Theorem 12. Let S be a consistent system of equations in integers $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n$, where each equation in S is one of the following two forms: $x_i = 1$ or $x_i + x_j = x_k$. Then S has an integer solution $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)$ in which $|x_j| \leq (\sqrt{5})^{n-1}$ for each j.

Proof. We shall describe how to find a solution $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ in which $|x_j| \leq (\sqrt{5})^{n-1}$ for each j. We can assume that for a certain $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ the equation $x_i = 1$ belongs to S, as otherwise $(0, 0, \ldots, 0)$ is a solution. Without lost of generality we can assume that the equation $x_1 = 1$ belongs to S. Analogously as in the proof of Theorem 11, we construct a system of linear equations with variables $x_2, \ldots, x_n$. For the augmented matrix of this system, the length of each row is not greater than $\sqrt{5}$. We finish the proof by applying Hadamard's inequality and Lemma 4.

$\square$

References

[1] S. Basu, R. Pollack, M. F. Roy, *Algorithms in real algebraic geometry*, 2nd ed., Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006.

[2] I. Borosh, M. Flahive, D. Rubin, B. Treybig, *A sharp bound for solutions of linear Diophantine equations*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 105 (1989), 844–846.

[3] M. Davis, *Hilbert's tenth problem is unsolvable*, Amer. Math. Monthly 80 (1973), 233–269.

[4] M. Davis, *Computability and unsolvability*, Dover Publications, New York, 1982.

[5] J. Dugundji, *An extension of Tietze's theorem*, Pacific J. Math. 1 (1951), 353–367.

[6] G. Faltings, *Endlichkeitssätze für abelsche Varietäten über Zahlkörpern*, Invent. Math. 73 (1983), no. 3, 349–366, Erratum ibid. 75 (1984), no. 2, 381.

[7] D. Yu. Grigor'ev and N. N. Vorobjov, Jr., *Solving systems of polynomial inequalities in subexponential time*, J. Symbolic Comput. 5 (1988), 37–64.

[8] J. P. Jones, D. Sato, H. Wada, D. Wiens, *Diophantine representation of the set of prime numbers*, Amer. Math. Monthly 83 (1976), 449–464.

[9] J. P. Jones and Yu. V. Matijasevič, *Proof of recursive unsolvability of Hilbert's tenth problem*, Amer. Math. Monthly 98 (1991), 689–709.

[10] A. Kozłowski and A. Tyszka, *A Conjecture of Apoloniusz Tyszka on the Addition of Rational Numbers*, http://demonstrations.wolfram.com/AConjectureOfApoloniuszTyszkaOnTheAdditionOfRationalNumbers/, 2008.

[11] S. Lang, *Number theory III: Diophantine geometry*, Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences 60, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991.

[12] G. Lettl, *Finitely arithmetically fixed elements of a field*, Arch. Math. (Basel) 87 (2006), 530–538.

[13] Yu. V. Matijasevič, *The Diophantineness of enumerable sets*, Soviet Math. Dokl. 11 (1970), 354–358.

[14] Yu. V. Matijasevič, *Hilbert's tenth problem*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1993.

[15] G. Sansone and J .W. S. Cassels, *Sur le problème de M. Werner Mnich*, Acta Arith. 7 (1961/1962), 187–190.

[16] Th. Skolem, *Unlösbarkeit von Gleichungen, deren entsprechende Kongruenz für jeden Modul lösbar ist*, Avh. Norske Vid. Akad. Oslo. I. (1942), no. 4.

[17] A. Tyszka, *A discrete form of the theorem that each field endomorphism of* $\mathbb{R}$ ($\mathbb{Q}_p$) *is the identity*, Aequationes Math. 71 (2006), 100–108.

[18] A. Tyszka, *On* $\emptyset$*-definable elements in a field*, Collect. Math. 58 (2007), 73–84.

[19] A. Tyszka, *Arithmetic neighbourhoods of numbers*, Int. Math. Forum 3 (2008), no. 5-8, 349–362.

[20] N. N. Vorobjov, Jr., *Estimates of real roots of a system of algebraic equations*, J. Sov. Math. 34 (1986), 1754–1762.

Apoloniusz Tyszka
Technical Faculty
Hugo Kołłątaj University
Balicka 116B, 30-149 Kraków, Poland
E-mail: *rttyszka@cyf-kr.edu.pl*